



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

He endeavors to prove that both of these charges are unfounded. He maintains that the Tory peers in their opposition to the first Reform Bill and the removal of nonconformist disabilities were animated by high and worthy motives; that their opposition to the removal of Roman Catholic disabilities was not without extenuation or excuse. He further maintains that far from oppressing the people at the present day, the House of Lords is the main security that the will of the people shall be clearly ascertained in order that it may afterward prevail. He then scrutinizes the remedies proposed by the Radicals. The two principal schemes, *i. e.*, "abolition of the House of Lords" and "its conversion into a United States Senate," he considers "crude, ill-considered and impracticable."

The Radical party's charges, above considered, are unfounded, still there is a just ground for complaint "in the callous and contemptuous treatment of measures that have passed the House of Commons at the hands of the peers who as a rule take no part in politics and pay little or no attention to political questions." The author thinks that the present structure of the House of Lords needs to be modified and that this must be done by decreasing or abolishing the number of "hereditary legislators," and increasing the number who, because of certain qualifications, are appointed for life. In this reorganized upper chamber the colonies must be represented as they should be in the House of Commons. The hereditary peers should elect a certain number to represent the peerage in the House of Lords.

Part IV of the book is very satisfactory, but the first three parts are too long. The author devotes altogether too much space in them to questions of minor importance. The gist of the book is that instead of a baronage the upper chamber should be an imperial senate, containing representatives from all parts of the British Empire. "Hereditary is the essence of a baronage; selection is the essence of a senate."

J. Q. ADAMS.

University of Pennsylvania.

Europe 476-918. By CHARLES OMAN. (Periods of European History.) Pp. 532. Price, \$1.75. New York and London: Macmillan & Co., 1893.

The City-State of the Greeks and Romans. A Survey Introductory to the Study of Ancient History. By W. WARDE FOWLER. Pp. 332. Price, \$1.10. London and New York: Macmillan & Co., 1893.

In his volume on "Europe 476-918" Mr. Oman has the advantage of dealing with a period of which there exists no continuous narrative

in English. As we should expect from his previous books, the author gives a well-written, and in the main trustworthy account of political and military affairs. The narrative is limited to the Continent and gives rather more space to Eastern Europe than is usual in books of this kind. There are maps and genealogical tables, but no references to sources or to modern works. The book, as a whole, gives the impression of being designed as a manual for those who wish to "get up" the period rather than as an introduction to further study. Emphasis is laid on the facts of dynastic and military history rather than upon the underlying constructive forces that were making a new Europe out of the turmoil and confusion of this transitional age. The Church is treated only in its relations to political history, without reference to the development of ecclesiastical organization or the growth and influence of monasticism. We look in vain for some description of the beginnings of feudalism, which is quite ignored until the time of Charles the Bald, and then almost taken for granted. One familiar with recent investigations in this field would hardly dismiss Charles Martel with the statement that "he occasionally laid military burdens on church-land" (p. 295), or say that the day of feudal cavalry was "just beginning" in the time of Charles the Bald. Mr. Oman's apparent ignorance of the part played by cavalry in the growth of the feudal system is the more remarkable since he has given an excellent account of the military results of feudalism—how "it was the mailed feudal horseman, and the impregnable walls of the feudal castle, that foiled the attacks of the Dane, the Saracen, and the Hungarian." It is evident that the author is more at home in the history of Eastern than of Western Europe, but after making all allowance one is surprised to find (p. 372) that in the time of Charles the Great "a barbarian Augustus would be unprecedented."

Mr. Warde Fowler's little volume on "The City-State of the Greeks and Romans" is an attempt to "construct in outline a biography, as it were, of that form of state in which both Greeks and Romans lived and made their most valuable contributions to our modern civilization, tracing it from its birth in pre-historic times to its dissolution under the Roman Empire." Such a biography was well worth the writing. No one can begin to understand Greek or Roman political life without grasping clearly the idea of the ancient City-State, which differed from the modern state in being a city, and from the modern city in being at the same time a state. Only in this way can one appreciate the fundamental differences between ancient and modern politics and avoid the misleading comparisons in which those differences are persistently ignored. Mr. Fowler's book cannot help

proving useful to students both of history and of political science. Even if we should grant the author's contention that the book contains "absolutely nothing new," he would place us under obligation to him for the fresh and stimulating manner in which he has set forth that which is old but too often overlooked. He explains the nature of the City-State and sketches the chief epochs in its history without any of the special pleading or insistence on one idea which characterize such a book as "The Ancient City" of M. Fustel de Coulanges. At the same time the book has many suggestive statements like the following, on page 315: "Cicero stands in this respect to Rome as Demosthenes to Athens; he was the last-born legitimate son of the Roman City-State . . . This is obvious throughout his writings, and is the real clue to the right appreciation of his political career."

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

A Constitutional History of the House of Lords. By LUKE OWEN PIKE. Pp. xxxv and 405. Price, \$4.00. London and New York: Macmillan & Co., 1894.

The author of this volume is a barrister-at-law, assistant keeper of the Public Records and editor of the "Year Books" published under the direction of the Master of Rolls. He has had, therefore, opportunities for producing a work at first hand, and the internal evidences go to prove that he has lived up to his opportunity in this respect. He cites abundantly the original sources of his facts, and indicates some instances in which his more careful investigation into the sources has led to the correction of long standing and oft repeated errors in the writings of Blackstone, Hallam and others.

The declaration is made that the author has written without political bias, and that the arrival of his work has not been influenced by the present agitation over the House of Lords. While the general tenor of the work supports this statement, yet we must regard the publication of the work as very timely indeed. But it would have seemed even more so to the student of practical politics had he seen fit to investigate, "without political bias," those great conflicts between the lords and commons for political supremacy in Parliament. Such a discussion would have thrown some light on the present peculiar position of the lords. It is now very evident that Great Britain, as well as the rest of the world, needs light just now, for what to do with the "chamber of all the prejudices" is just now very far removed from settlement, and in spite of recent agitations public sentiment does not point to either "ending or mending" the lords. In fact their successful opposition to Home Rule seems to have made